

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/014,745	10/23/2001	Daniel E. Boss	403391	9390
7590 12/05/2003			EXAMINER	
Harold V. Stotland			CHANG, YEAN HSI	
Seyfarth Shaw	4 - 1			.
Suite 4200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
55 East Monroe Street			2835	
Chicago, IL 6	0603-5803		DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/014,745	BOSS ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yean-Hsi Chang	2835			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2003 FAILS TO PLATherefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appl	ication. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W/706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Ottimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for a later than SIX MONTHS from the man as FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF the date on which the petition under 37 d of extension and the corresponding and the shortened statutory period for reperfice later than three months after the notice.	iling date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension mount of the fee. The appropriate extension of the fee. The final Office action: or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CI	t's Brief must be filed within the FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissa	period set forth in of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or search	ı (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number o	f finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):				
 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		f to issues which were newly			
 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v 					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	;;				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 2-23.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applying a point and a point a p	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme					
10. Other:		$\overline{\bigcirc}$			
	nana	N SCHUBERG			
	SUPERVISORY	' PATENT EXAMINER GY CENTER 2800			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration of Mr. Richard K. Williams, one of the inventors of this application, has shown a great result of a measurement of the sound power emanating from different arrangements of a disk drive, and a good reason for installing a disk drive with the PCB facing the bracket. However, figs. 5 and 8 of reference Pottebaum show the same arrangement.